

**Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13-15, 17, and 18 are rejected. Claims 9, 12, and 16 are objected to. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 11, and 18 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 18 have been amended. Claims 4 and 12 have been canceled. New claims 19-22 have been added.

***Claim Objections***

The Examiner had numerous objections to the claims. First, it appears that the Examiner did not take into consideration a preliminary amendment that was filed with the original application. In that preliminary amendment many of the words “including” were changed to “comprising.” Thus, the Examiner’s objections of the word “including” are moot. Please let Applicant’s representative know if you did not receive the preliminary amendment.

Most of the other changes that the Examiner requested were put into the claims. However, some changes would leave the claims grammatically questionable. For example, it does not appear correct to say “analyzing at device level.” Rather, “analyzing at a device level” or “analyzing at the device level” is more accurate. Such changes were not made. If the Examiner believes these changes still need to be made, then perhaps a phone conference would be advisable discussing such changes.

***Cited Art***

The Action cites:

Hammouda et al., “A Fully Automated Approach for Analog Circuit Reuse” (hereinafter (Hammouda”);

Dessouky et al., “Analog IP Design Retargeting based on Design Extraction and Transistor Optimization (hereinafter “Dessouky”); and

Berger et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0033550 (hereinafter “Berger”).

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

The Action rejects claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the method is not tied to a statutory class. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, the requirements for 35 U.S.C. § 101 also relate to “transformations.”

M.P.E.P. § 2106 states the following:

A claimed invention is directed to a practical application of a 35 U.S.C. 101 judicial exception when it:

- (A) “transforms” an article or physical object to a different state or thing; or
- (B) otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, based on the factors discussed below.

***(1) Practical Application by Physical Transformation***

USPTO personnel first shall review the claim and determine if it provides a transformation or reduction of an article to a different state or thing. If USPTO personnel find such a transformation or reduction, USPTO personnel shall end the inquiry and find that the claim meets the statutory requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101. If USPTO personnel do not find such a transformation or reduction, they must determine whether the claimed invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Claim 1 of the present application is based on a transformation. The claim requires “converting the analog circuit from the source technology to the target technology”. The claim further includes “resizing the analog circuit.” Clearly, these are transformations, which should end the inquiry under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Such transformations seem so clearly to be statutory under the M.P.E.P. and the law, that Applicant did not further amend the claim. If the Examiner still believes that further amendment is required, the Examiner should more fully specify why the claims are not transformations.

It is therefore believed that the rejection is traversed.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

The Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 13, 17, and 18 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammouda. The Action further rejects claims 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hammouda in view of Dessouky and claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hammouda in view of Berger.

Applicants respectfully submit the claims are allowable over the cited art. The Examiner indicated that claims 4, 9, 12, and 16 are objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims (See Office action, page 9 as to claims 9, 12, and 16 and page 10, as to claim 4.)

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 4. Additionally, claim 11 includes the limitations of claim 12. Finally, claim 18 was amended to include similar limitations as claim 12.

Claims 19-22 are new. Claim 19 is supported by original claim 1 plus the specification at page 5, lines 16-20, wherein it discusses resizing each transistor, resistor, and capacitor individually. This is in direct contrast to Hammouda, which describes that “[t]he recognition of such blocks in the design is very important in order to preserve some constraints of these blocks in the target technology . . . .” Hammouda clearly teaches block analysis as being “important.” By contrast, claim 19 states “resizing substantially each transistor, resistor, and capacitor individually, rather than treating such components in blocks, which include multiple of such components.” Thus, claim 19 is contradictory to the direct teaching of Hammouda. It is believed that Hammouda and the other references of record do not disclose resizing transistors, resistors and capacitors individually. Rather, transistors are treated in blocks with other transistors.

*Interview Request*

If the claims are not found by the Examiner to be allowable, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney to set up an interview to discuss this application.

*Conclusion*

The claims in their present form should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By



Robert F. Scotti  
Registration No. 39,830